



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,987	12/06/2000	Geoffrey L. Turner	TVDA-3078	8191

52940 7590 06/02/2006

TODD S. PARKHURST  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
131 S. DEARBORN STREET  
30TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60603

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/730,987

Applicant(s)

TURNER, GEOFFREY L.

Examiner

Lamont M. Spooner

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, 50-66 and 68-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, 50-66 and 68-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (applicant's arguments, p.22, "It does not teach or suggest the claimed preferred language identifier in combination with the replacement language database.", p.23 "that is not the same as providing a preferred language", and further preferred language discussions related to Fujita), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's arguments, p.23, "Independent claims 18 and 36 require identifying the preferred language based on a user identifier. Herbert does not teach that at all. Item 248 of Herbert is not a preferred language, it is a language ID for the language dependent table, the Examiner cannot concur, as item 248 of Fig. 22 relates to the preferred language, and as it relates to the user table, "27 (Spanish)" his users table 250 link).

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Herbert provides a descriptor database structure, and modification of the structure by including Fujita's replacement language database structure improves Herbert by having a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10). Regarding Malatesta, Herbert teaches of having descriptor values, therefore wherein Malatesta teaches, Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49, N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Herbert's descriptors by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for each descriptor. The motivation for

doing so would have been to provide recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-49), as it relates to Herbert's descriptors.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, 22-30, 32-38, 40-48, 50-54, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert, III (herein referred to as Herbert, US Patent No. 6,018,742 Jan. 25, 2000) in view of Fujita (US 5,612,872).

As per **claim 1**, Herbert discloses a computer readable medium comprising a language database structure, comprising:

a descriptor database structure including at least one descriptor (Fig. 22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor wherein each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 Hammers, Pliers, Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor value wherein the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 English, Spanish, French),

a preferred language identifier for identifying a user's preferred language based on information relating to the user (Fig. 22 item 248).

but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for the corresponding preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-21, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language for his preferred language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 2**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 "English", 129, Fig. 23, Language\_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang\_ID, Lang\_Name).

As per **claim 3**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 3 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46, C.12.lines 9-59-language identifier points to language record containing relevant language information).

As per **claim 5**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the at least one descriptor, the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor, and the language identifier for each descriptor value are stored in a table (Fig. 22).

As per **claim 6**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 6 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor are stored in a first table (Fig. 22 items 240, 244, 238, Fig. 22. items 246, and 232), and wherein the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value are stored in a second table (Fig. 22 items 246, 248).

As per **claim 7**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the descriptor database structure comprises a table having a name that includes the language identifier, wherein descriptors and associated descriptor values expressed in the language are stored in the table, and wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242, row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2 "Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language).

As per **claim 8**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 8 depends. Herbert further discloses:

a user database structure including at least one user identifier which identifies a user (Fig. 23 item 250).

As per **claim 9**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 53-59).

As per **claim 10**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is a preferred language pointer (C.12.lines 55-59).

As per **claim 11**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 11 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language (C.12.lines 55-59-retrieving a language appropriate record).

As per **claim 12**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 12 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm which automatically determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the algorithm for performing the program steps) based on stored information about a user and further wherein said stored information does not include the user's preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context identifier interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context dependent discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France, Germany...French and German).

As per **claim 14**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends. Herbert further discloses:



an application database structure which includes: at least one output descriptor, wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database); and an output zone of an output medium associated with each output descriptor (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor).

As per **claim 15**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 15 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields).

As per **claim 16**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Herbert further discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views, Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

As per **claim 17**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 17 depends. Herbert further discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the output zones as indicated previously).

As per **claims 18 and 36**, Herbert discloses a computer-implemented method of generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium, comprising the steps of:

providing a descriptor database structure including at least one descriptor (Fig. 22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor wherein each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 Hammers, Pliers, Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor value wherein the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 English, Spanish, French);

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22 item 248, Fig. 23);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (Fig. 22 item 248, Fig. 23);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously), but lacks explicitly:

providing a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language

generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language and generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-21, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 19 and 37**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 19 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 “English”, 129, Fig. 23, Language\_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang\_ID, Lang\_Name).

As per **claim 20 and 38**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 20 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46, C.12.lines 9-59- language identifier points to language record containing relevant language information).

As per **claim 22 and 40**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 22 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises providing a table which includes the at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 items 246), the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 item 232), and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 item 248).

As per **claim 23 and 41**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 23 depends. Herbert further discloses the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises:

providing a first table which includes the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 items 246, items 232); and

providing a second table which includes the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 items 248, 232, 234, 236).

As per **claims 24 and 42**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 24 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises providing a table having a name that includes the language identifier (Fig. 22 row table- "129 (English)"), wherein the table includes the descriptors and the associated descriptor values which are expressed in the language (Fig. 22 descriptor 1000, 1001, descriptor values Hammers, Pliers), and wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242, row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2 "Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language).

As per **claims 25 and 43**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 25 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of determining a user identifier includes prompting the user for information from which the user identifier may be ascertained (Fig. 23, C.14.lines 12-15).

As per **claims 26 and 44**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 26 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of identifying a preferred language comprises identifying a preferred language identifier from a user database structure, said preferred language identifier

being used to identify the preferred language, and said user database structure including (C.12.lines 40-67):

a list of user identifiers, said list including the user identifier of the user (Fig. 23);  
and

a preferred language identifier associated with each user identifier (Fig. 23).

As per **claims 27 and 45**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 27 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 40-67, C.13.lines 1-27).

As per **claims 28 and 46**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 28 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier includes a preferred language pointer (C.12.lines 55-59).

As per **claims 29 and 47**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 29 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language (Fig. 22, Fig 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 55-59, C.13.lines 1-27-the pointer points to the preferred language location for information retrieval).

As per **claims 30 and 48**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 30 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm automatically determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the algorithm for performing the program steps) based on stored information about a user and further wherein said stored information does not include the user's preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context identifier interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context dependent discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France, Germany...French and German).

As per **claims 32 and 50**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 32 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium comprises providing an application database structure which includes (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor):

the at least one output descriptor, wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database); and

the output zone of the output medium associated with each output descriptor (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor).

As per **claims 33 and 51**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 33 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,- the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields).

As per **claims 34 and 52**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 33, upon which claim 34 depends. Herbert further discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views, Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

As per **claims 35 and 53**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 35 depends. Herbert further discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the output zones as indicated previously).

As per **claims 54**, Herbert discloses a computer system for generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium, comprising:

a processor; a memory device; an input device coupled to the processor; an output device coupled to the processor; a language database structure coupled to the processor; and a computer code located on the memory device (Fig. 29, C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14),



wherein the output device includes the output medium (Fig. 29 item 514,  
C.16.lines 34-41),

wherein the processor executes the computer code (C.16.lines 56-65),  
wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor database  
structure (C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14, Fig. 22),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one descriptor (Fig.  
22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor such that each descriptor  
value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 item 232), and a language identifier for each  
descriptor value such that the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item  
248), and

wherein the computer code comprises an algorithm which includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines 10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (C.14.lines  
10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output  
descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23,  
C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields  
identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a  
descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-  
unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred  
language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for the preferred

language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language

generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language and generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-21, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

.As per **claim 72**, Herbert discloses a computer program product, comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied therein for generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium (C.16.lines 27-65, C.17.lines 1-14),

wherein the computer readable program code comprises an algorithm which utilizes a language database structure(C.16.lines 56-65),

wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor database structure (Fig. 22, item 246),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor such that each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 item 232), and a language identifier for each descriptor value such that the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item 248), and

wherein the algorithm includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines 10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (C.14.lines 10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language

generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language and generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-21, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The

motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

7. Claims 4, 21, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert in view of Fujita and further in view of Malatesta et al. (herein referred to as Malatesta, US Patent No. 5,442,782 Aug. 15, 1995).

As per **claim 4**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Herbert further discloses a first descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values, HAMMERS, MARTILLO, MARTEAU), wherein a second descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1001 contains the descriptor values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the combination lacks disclosing N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49) N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-49).

As per **claim 21 and 39**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 21 depends. Herbert further discloses a first descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values, HAMMERS, MARTILLO, MARTEAU), wherein a second

descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22- descriptor 1001 contains the descriptor values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the combination lacks disclosing N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49) N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-49).

8. **Claims 55-66, and 68-71** fall within the scope of the previously rejected claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.

9. **Claims 73 and 74**, fall within the scope of the previously rejected claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2626

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lms  
5/30/06



**VIJAY CHAWAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**